Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/089,013	MARSHALL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Emily Bernhardt	1624

All Participants:

(1) _Emily Bernhardt_.

(2) _Mr. Kanagy_.

Date of Interview: _18 February 2004_

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
New claims 17-19

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The species covered by the newly presented claims is free of the 112 and art rejections of the previous action as particularly pointed out by applicants in their response. Nothing relevant found from a search for the new species presented. The term "monohydrochloride" lacks antecedent basis in the specification but "hydrochloride" would be acceptable. Also intended use(s) need to be inserted into the Abstract. Mr. Kanagy agreed to the above change in the claim and authorized the examiner to insert a use statement in the abstract consistent with specification's teachings.